

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2004, claim 2 have been cancelled and claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-10 are active in this application, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent. The Office Action indicates that claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are allowable if presented in independent form.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these

Amendments. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4 and 7-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,038,561 issued to Snyder, *et al.* (“Snyder”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of allowable claim 2. Amended claim 1 further recites “wherein the step (c) includes steps of: determining if third IP information has been received from the research center PCs, the third IP information including *technical analyses and opinion contents*; and storing the third IP information if the third IP information has been received”. Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over

Snyder. Claim 4 that is dependent from claim 1 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Similarly, independent claim 4 has been amended to further recite that “an IP information analyzing unit ... receiving the extracted IP information and storing the same together with *data containing predetermined opinion contents of the extracted IP information from research center personal computers (PCs) ...*”. Snyder fails to disclose or suggest storing the extracted IP information and data containing predetermined opinion contents of the extracted IP information from the research center PCs. Thus, it is submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Snyder. Claims 7-10 that are dependent from claim 4 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over claims 1, 4 and 7-10 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1 and 3-10 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 26, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

\\COM388687.1